This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the final Office Action dated October 2, 2006. Claims 1, 3 to 5, 7 to 9, 11 to 13, 15 to 17, 19 to 21, 23 and 24 remain pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17 and 21 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Without conceding the correctness of the rejections, the claims have nonetheless been amended to more positively recite the claimed features. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112 rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3 to 5, 7 to 9, 11 to 13, 15 to 17, 19 to 21, 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,796,633 (Burgess) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,101,500 (Lau) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,717,604 (Wiggins). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention concerns distinguishably displaying a license management server computer on a display screen. According to the invention, a data processing apparatus first discriminates at least one computer that has a server function from among a plurality of computers. The data processing apparatus secondly discriminates, from the at least one computer discriminated as having the server function, at least one computer that has a license server function. The data processing apparatus thirdly discriminates, from among the computers discriminated as having the license server function, a license management server computer that is used by a data processing apparatus and that has a license server function for issuing a predetermined license to the data processing apparatus. The display is then controlled to display as a visual symbol the

license management server computer such that it is distinguished from other computers that are discriminated by the third discriminating means/step.

Referring specifically to the claims, amended independent Claim 1 is a data processing apparatus that communicates data through a network to each of a plurality of computers and a plurality of peripheral devices connected to the network, comprising display means for displaying the plurality of computers and the plurality of peripheral devices as symbol information, respectively, on a display screen, first discriminating means for discriminating, from the plurality of computers, at least one computer that has a server function, second discriminating means for discriminating, from the at least one computer that has a server function discriminated by the first discriminating means, at least one computer that has a license server function, third discriminating means for discriminating, from the at least one computer that has the license server function discriminated by the second discriminating means, a license management server computer that is used by the data processing apparatus and has a license server function for issuing a predetermined license to the data processing apparatus, and first control means for controlling the display means to display as a visual symbol the license management server computer discriminated by the third discriminating means such that the license management server computer is distinguished from computer that are not discriminated by the third discriminating means.

Amended independent Claims 5 is an apparatus that includes features substantially corresponding to Claim 1, while Claims 9 and 13 are method claims that substantially correspond to Claims 1 and 5, respectively, and Claims 17 and 21 are computer medium claims that substantially correspond to Claims 1 and 5, respectively.

The applied art, alone or in any permissible combination, is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of Claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17 and 21, and in particular, is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of a data processing apparatus performing a first discriminating step of discriminating, from a plurality of computers, at least one computer that has a server function, a second discriminating step of discriminating, from the at least one computer that has a server function discriminated by the first discriminating step, at least one computer that has a license server function, and a third discriminating step of discriminating, from the at least one computer that has the license server function discriminated in the second discriminating step, a license management server computer that is used by the data processing apparatus and has a license server function for issuing a predetermined license to at least the data processing apparatus, and then controlling a display means to display as a visual symbol the license management server computer such that the license management server computer is distinguished from computers that are not discriminated by the third discriminating step.

Burgess merely discloses that a system monitors the performance of computers and provides alerts when the performance reaches an alertable level. The Office Action admits that Burgess fails to disclose discriminating a license management server computer as claimed. Thus, since Burgess does not discriminate the license server computer, it also cannot control a display, as claimed, so that the license server management computer is distinguished from other computers.

Lau is merely seen to disclose determining a position of an object within a hierarchical structure. Objects can be flagged on a display so as to indicate the object's level in the hierarchy. Thus, while Lau may distinguish one object from another on

- 16 -

display in accordance with its hierarchy, Lau, like Burgess, fails to perform the three discriminating steps as claimed, and fails to discriminate a license server management computer from at least one computer discriminated as having a license server function. Additionally, Lau fails to control the display to distinguish the license management server computer from computers that are not discriminated as being a license management server. Thus, Lau is not seen to teach anything that, when combined with Burgess, would have resulted in the claimed invention.

Wiggins is also not seen to add anything to overcome the deficiencies of Burgess and/or Lau. Wiggins merely discloses that, if a computer tries to obtain a license from a licensor computer and a license does not exist, the computer is connected to another licensor server to attempt to obtain a license. If there are no available licenses, a message to this effect is displayed. Thus, like Burgess and Lau, Wiggins also fails to perform the three claimed discriminating steps, and fails to discriminate a license management server computer from at least one computer discriminated as having a license server function. Wiggins also fails to then controlling a display to display the license management server computer as a visual symbol such that the license management server computer is distinguished from computers that are not discriminated as being a license management server. Therefore, the proposed combination of Burgess, Lau and Wiggins, simply fails to teach the features of the invention.

In view of the foregoing deficiencies of the applied art, amended independent Claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17 and 21, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to be allowable.

No other matters having been raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

REQUEST FOR EXAMINER INTERVIEW

In the event that the Examiner finds the application is not yet in condition for allowance, he is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' undersigned representative prior to issuance of the next action on the merits to schedule an interview. In this regard, the Office Action indicated that Examiner recommends that Applicant amend the claims to include features argued as being patentable. While Applicant believes the claims correspond to the arguments made, Applicant nonetheless requests and interview to further discuss the Examiner proposed claim language.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Edward Kmett/

_____

Edward A. Kmett
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 125475v1